THE Reconstructionist

Vol. IX. June 25, 1943 Sivan 22, 5703 No. 10

EDITORIALS
- *The Martyrdom of Szamul Zygielbojm*
- *Post-War "Reconstruction" in Palestine*
- *Lord Nathan on the Dissolution of the Comintern*

WHAT THE AMERICAN JEWISH CONFERENCE SHOULD ASK FOR
By Mordecai M. Kaplan

KELAL YISRAEL—A DEMOCRATIC CONCEPT
By Ario S. Hyams

THE SYNAGOGUE SERVICE FROM A PEDAGOGIC VIEWPOINT
By Harry Elkin

IS THE HEBREW LANGUAGE INDISPENSABLE TO JUDAISM?
By Louis Barish

AN ETHICAL WILL AND A MEMORIAL TRIBUTE

Dedicated to the advancement of Judaism as a religious civilization, to the upbuilding of Israel's ancient homeland, and to the furtherance of universal freedom, justice and peace.

RECONSTRUCTIONIST LITERATURE OFFERED BY THE JEWISH RECONSTRUCTIONIST FOUNDATION:

BOOKS

JUDAISM AS A CIVILIZATION, by Mordecai M. Kaplan, the basic text of the Reconstructionist philosophy. (Out of print.)

JUDAISM IN TRANSITION, by Mordecai M. Kaplan $1.50

THE MEANING OF GOD IN MODERN JEWISH RELIGION, by Mordecai M. Kaplan 2.75

JEWISH RECONSTRUCTIONIST PAPERS, ed. by M. M. Kaplan, a selection of articles and editorials from *The Reconstructionist* 2.00

THE FUTURE OF JUDAISM IN AMERICA, by Eugene Kohn 1.25

THE MAKING OF THE MODERN JEW, by Milton Steinberg 2.50

CREATIVE JUDAISM, by Ira Eisenstein, a popular presentation of *Judaism As A Civilization* 1.25

WHAT WE MEAN BY RELIGION, by Ira Eisenstein, a popular presentation of *The Meaning of God in Modern Jewish Religion* 1.25

JUDAISM IN A CHANGING CIVILIZATION, by Samuel Dinin 1.25

SHIR HADASH, Supplementary Readings and Prayers for the High Holidays, edited by Eugene Kohn ..... .50

THE NEW HAGGADAH, edited by Mordecai M. Kaplan, Eugene Kohn, and Ira Eisenstein ..... .75

PAMPHLETS

THE RECONSTRUCTIONIST PLATFORM.

TO BE OF NOT TO BE A JEW, by Milton Steinberg.

TOWARD A GUIDE FOR JEWISH RITUAL USAGE.

THE RECONSTRUCTIONIST VIEWPOINT, by Mordecai M. Kaplan.

THE MEANING OF RECONSTRUCTIONISM, by Mordecai M. Kaplan.

ZIONISM—(two articles)

Zionism and the New Opposition, *by Milton Steinberg.*

Reconstructionism and Zionism, *by Ira Eisenstein.*

Pamphlets, in quantities up to 15, are available gratis.
Additional copies are 5 cents each.

STUDY AIDS

Do you want to be placed on our mailing list to receive a copy of STUDY AIDS?

"STUDY" AIDS is prepared in connection with each issue of the magazine, and mailed to you bi-weekly. The contents include:

Questions, references and topics for discussion based on one editorial and one article in the current issue. These aids are intended as a guide for use in adult study groups, and are available without cost for this purpose.

To obtain Reconstructionist literature, or further information regarding the Jewish Reconstructionist Movement, apply to

THE JEWISH RECONSTRUCTIONIST FOUNDATION
15 West Eighty-Sixth Street, New York.
Telephone: SChuyler 4-7000

With this issue, publication is suspended until the Fall.

THE Reconstructionist

Vol. IX. June 25, 1943 Sivan 22, 5703 No. 10

EDITORIALS

THE MARTYRDOM OF SZAMUL ZYGIELBOJM

IN the midst of all the tragedies of our time there has occurred recently one tragedy of a special poignancy, a human calamity freighted with all the pain and anguish and protest of which the human heart is capable.

Szamul Zygielbojm, Polish Jew, leader of the Bund (the Polish Socialist Labor Movement) and member of the Polish Government-in-Exile took his life in London. Suicides, unfortunately, are no novelty in these harrowing days. No one knows, no one perhaps will ever know, how many sweet and decent human beings have been driven by despair to self-destruction. But Zygielbojm's suicide was not an act of desperation. He left behind him a letter explaining his course, a document that burns with so much passion and protest that it deserves to be recorded again and again as an instance of human nobility.

"The responsibility for the crime of murdering all the Jewish population in Poland falls in the first instance on the perpetrators, but indirectly it also weighs on the whole of humanity, the peoples and governments of the Allied States, which so far have made no effort toward a concrete action for the purpose of curtailing this crime. By passive observation of this murder of defenseless millions and the maltreatment of children and women, the men of those countries have become accomplices of criminals.

"By my death I wish to express my strongest protest against the inactivity with which the world is looking on and permitting the extermination of Jewish people. I know how little human life is worth, especially today. But as I was unable to do anything during my life, perhaps by my death I shall contribute to destroying the indifference of those who are able and should act in order to save now, maybe at the last moment, this handful of Polish Jews who are still alive from certain annihilation."

This then was Zygielbojm's motive, to shock and awaken the world, the civilized world, to the tragedy of his Jewish brethren in the Nazi-contrived Hells of Central Europe.

Zygielbojm's letter is a temperate one for a man about to commit so desperate an act. He does not say that the Polish Government-in-Exile has been indifferent to the fate of the Jews. Rather he acknowledges its efforts on their behalf. But those efforts, he insists, were too lit-

tle and too late. He does not charge that the United Nations altogether neglected the problem of the Jews. But he does charge, and with justice, that what they have done is not enough. He makes no accusations whatsoever against the Jews in free lands. But he might with propriety have levelled his accusation against them also.

Zygielbojm's act runs, of course, directly counter to the authoritative teachings of Judaism. The Jewish tradition has always inveighed against *ham'abbed atzmo ledaat,* one who deliberately takes his own life. Not that the Jewish tradition would have been regarded by him as an authority. As a Bundist, a socialist Yiddishist, Zygielbojm, in all likelihood, had very little sympathy for the Jewish religion. And yet there is in the Jewish tradition precedent for his course. For it is not unknown in Jewish history that individuals, indeed whole communities, have taken their lives rather than accept apostasy. And such individuals have always been regarded by Judaism not as sinful suicides but as martyrs.

Such is Zygielbojm, a martyr on behalf of the Jewish people and the cause of humanity. What has he achieved by his gesture of self-sacrifice? What has any martyr ever achieved?

He has attested supremely to truth and goodness and he has stirred, even if only slightly, the conscience of mankind. It is out of martyrdom such as his and those of thousands of others that men collectively have in all issues been prodded, sometimes against their will, toward humaneness.

We salute the martyred Zygielbojm. May his sacrifice not be in vain. May it move the Jews of the world and the governments of the United Nations to a heightened awareness of the plight of Israel in its exile. And we say of him, regardless as to whether he was religionist or anti-religionist, survivalist or assimilationist, that it is to him and to such as are like him that the epigram may be applied, *Zeker tzadik lib'rakah.*

POST-WAR "RECONSTRUCTION" IN PALESTINE

ON March 23 the High Commissioner of Palestine, MacMichael, delivered an address over the radio, in which he revealed a British plan for the reconstruction and development of Palestine after the war, and even disclosed that Sir Douglas Harris had already been designated to put the plan into effect. The address and the plan were at first hailed in some quarters as a hopeful sign of a new attitude on the part of the British government toward Jewish aspirations in Palestine. However, the full text of Ben Gurion's bitter and scathing denunciation of the plan, which has just been received, makes perfectly clear that the plan will not lead to the reconstruction of Palestine, but to the obstruction of the development of Palestine as a Jewish homeland.

The plan, on the face of it, seems innocent and reasonable enough. It calls for 1) the expansion of social services, health, education and recreation; 2) the strengthening and development of a few essential industries, even to the extent of subsidization; 3) the development of a comprehensive system of irrigation and drainage; 4) finding a steady market for the great citrus industry, etc. The plan even indicates how all this is to be financed—through an international loan, which will be hard to obtain because all the nations of the world will be clamoring for such loans, and through the use of local capital in Palestine.

Since most of the proposed projects are now carried on by the Jewish Agency out of its own resources, the plan would

indeed be a worthwhile contribution to the social and economic life of Palestine. What makes it suspect, however, are the sly and subtle qualifications with which each of the proposed measures is hedged, and the hypothesis upon which the whole scheme is predicated.

The plan of "Reconstruction" takes the White Paper of 1939 for granted. Each of the above proposals must therefore be appraised in the light of that fact. Take item two, for instance: the development and subsidization of a few essential industries. This is prefaced by a statement that Palestine is and must remain essentially an agricultural country. The present industrial expansion of Palestine is due to the war, and cannot be expected to continue after the war.

That is why a few of the essential industries, those which have a normal and vital role to play in the economic life of Palestine, are to be encouraged and strengthened; the rest presumably are to be liquidated. The Jewish Agency cannot be accused of overlooking the agricultural development of Palestine; but the question is: How much of the Palestinian Yishuv must subsist on agriculture? It is not necessary or possible to have more than twenty-five or thirty per cent of the population on the land. The Jewish Agency has sought to industrialize Palestine because of the immense significance an industrial Palestine would have for the entire Near East, as well as because its industrialization would be a means of providing for greater Jewish immigration. The expansion of Palestinian industry in the past few years has merely been an acceleration of a process which had already begun before the war and accentuates all the more the fact that only Palestine, of all the countries in the Near East, can become the industrial hub of that part of the world after the war. The adoption of the proposed "Plan of Reconstruction" would mean the liquidation of a great many of the industries which have been built up during the war and the freezing of the industrial potentialites of the land at a point fixed by the British government; in short, it would put an end to any industrial growth on a large scale.

Or take item three: irrigation and drainage. According to the White Paper, the Jews are to be confined to a few of the larger cities and limited to definite sections of the country. These sections have already been drained and irrigated by means of Jewish resources. The government proposal, on the basis of the White Paper, will thus be of tremendous aid to the Arabs, but of little aid to the Jews. The same is true with regard to the expansion of the social services. MacMichael gallantly recognizes the extent to which the Jews of Palestine have taken care of their own social, educational and recreational needs; but he adds, the Arabs are largely deficient in these services. What the "Reconstruction Plan" proposes to do is gradually to bring to the Arabs the same services and standards enjoyed by the Jews at the expense of the Jews, who, paying the larger share of the taxes, will in reality be subsidizing social services for the Arabs. The same is true of other points in the program.

The real pay-off is the British proposal to finance the scheme. MacMichael's warning that it will be very difficult to negotiate a loan outside of Palestine is obvious. It means that the Yishuv will have to rely on the other alternative which he proposed: local capital within the country, which again means Jewish capital. The Jews are thus to be given an opportunity to play the role of philanthropists and to develop the country for the Arabs; in exchange for which the Jews now in Palestine will be graciously allowed to continue their existence un-

molested, their rights and life and property to be protected by British imperial power.

Let us make no mistake about this plan. It is all of a piece with Nuri Pasha's plan for an Arab Federation — just released with British blessing and connivance, with Churchill's support of the White Paper, and with other signs to which we have called attention during the past year. The Jews in Palestine are to be ghettoized in an Arabized Palestine, which is to be part of a Pan-Arab Federation. Unless we make ourselves heard and win the United States and other nations to our cause, Palestine will not only not become a Jewish commonwealth; it will not even be a land of refuge for those homeless Jews who will knock on its gates for admission after the war.

LORD NATHAN ON THE DISSOLUTION OF THE COMINTERN

THE dissolution of the Comintern is undoubtedly one of the most important events of the war. The end of the Third International represents, in many respects, the end of an era. There has been considerable discussion concerning the sincerity of Stalin and the Communist Party in Russia, and many opinions have been voiced about the motives underlying this significant step. But the general feeling seems to be that the Third International is quite dead, beyond the hope of resurrection, and that the possibilities of achieving a lasting peace in the world have been greatly enhanced by the passing of the late and not-so-lamented Comintern.

For Jews the dissolution of the Comintern may have strange and unforeseen implications. One of these was brought to our attention recently by the despatch from London, which reported the annual meeting of the Anglo-American Jewish Association. Lord Nathan there said that "the World Jewish Congress should follow Stalin's example in international affairs, implying that the Congress should dissolve itself." We confess that we might never have thought of placing the World Jewish Congress in the same category with the Comintern, if not for this unfortunate statement of Lord Nathan. His suggestion is of a piece with those of American Jews who ask whether Zionism and Americanism are compatible, a question which rarely, if ever, occurs to a Gentile of good will. Leave it to a Jew to put ideas into peoples' heads about the dangers of Jewish collective action.

At any rate, the unthinkable has not only been thought, but has been uttered. The dissolution of the Comintern represents a triumph for nationalism, and by the same token, it may mean a setback for international thinking and acting. If the end of the Comintern will be used to bolster attacks upon all forms of internationalism, it will prove to have been a disastrous event. It is most important, at this stage of world history, to remind ourselves that there are good forms of internationalism and bad forms; good forms of nationalism, religion, education—and bad forms. We must combat the bad, and encourage the good. The Communist International was a bad form of internationalism. It was conspiratorial in character. Its avowed aim was to undermine and ultimately to destroy existing national governments. Judaism, as a form of internationalism, is beneficent. It does not wage war against governments. It is not belligerent. It seeks to imbue its members with a faith in God, in the possibilities of life abundant, with a desire to adhere in their personal lives to the highest ethical standards, and with the love of the Jewish cultural heritage. This kind of internationalism is compatible with all those

(*Continued on Page* 17)

What the American Jewish Conference Should Ask For

By MORDECAI M. KAPLAN

Jewish Emancipation As Spurious Freedom

EMANCIPATION is the name which has been given to the movement, begun some 150 years ago, to remove the medieval disabilities of the Jews and to grant them equal civic and political rights with the rest of the populations of the countries in which they lived. When the idea of the Emancipation was still new, it seemed to many Jews like the beginning of a Messianic era.

This is quite comprehensible, for, throughout the Middle Ages, which for the Jews of Eastern Europe lasted virtually until a generation ago, the Jews lived under intolerable conditions. They were isolated, as in Czarist Russia, within some narrow territorial confine called "the Pale," or were forced within walled-off parts of cities called ghettos. As individuals, the Jews had no political status and, as a community, they were subject and tributary to the sovereign power. They were everywhere aliens and exiles living on the sufferance of the rulers who tolerated them only to the extent that they found it expedient to do so. When the rulers found it inexpedient to harbor them, they were expelled. Their economic life was subject to all sorts of restrictions, and they were the objects of legislation designed to degrade them and impose on them the stigma of inferiority. Little wonder then that they hailed the abolition of these medieval restrictions and their admission to citizenship in the lands of their residence as an act of emancipation. In a snse, it was that.

And yet the emancipation of the Jews through their incorporation in the body politic of the nations of the West was not all that it seemed. It had to be purchased at a price, and was granted only conditionally and with reservations. In some countries—as for example, in the France of Napoleon—the terms were made quite explicit; in others, they were tacitly assumed. Everywhere the purchase-price for emancipation was the surrender of Jewish social and cultural autonomy. Everywhere it was expected of Jews that they lose their identity as a distinct people. If they were permitted to retain a certain measure of religious distinctiveness, it was on the commonly accepted theory that religion was a mere matter of opinion, a private concern of the individual. Yet there were many Gentiles and Jews by whom even the legitimacy of this distinction was called into question. This attitude was expressed on the part of many Gentiles, by demanding conversion to Christianity as a condition of social equality, and on the part of many Jews, by accepting it. Even Jews who sought to retain Jewish identity by reconsructing Judaism on the lines of a religous denomination felt the need of eliminating from Jewish religion the nationalistic elements that had been a part of it from its origin.

It is characteristic that the Jewish masses from the first were suspicious of emancipation. They clung with almost fanatical tenacity to customs that distinguished them from the Gentiles, even where those customs were not prescribed by Jewish law. They insisted, for example, on retaining the long gabardine or *kapotte* and the *peot* or ear-locks. They sensed intuitively that the Emancipation meant the dissolution of the Jewish peo-

ple. But the wealthy Jews were interested in the opportunities for financial and social rewards which their wealth held out to them under conditions of emancipation. They saw in the abolition of the old feudal restrictions new vistas of opportunity for successful careers. Since the eminence given them by their wealth and the need for capital in an increasingly commercialized society brought them into close contact with the Gentiles, it was to them that the Gentile leaders turned for assurance that the Jews would accept the terms on which Emancipation was granted. The wealthy Jews, for example, dominated the "Sanhedrin" which Napoleon called together for the express purpose of having the Jews renounce their traditional legal autonomy. Thus wealthy Jews imposed on the Jewish masses the terms and conditions under which emancipation was to be enjoyed. For the masses were not consulted and the wealthy acted in their own interest, which they no doubt rationalized in a way that made it seem to coincide with the interest of Jews generally.

Now, an imposed emancipation, accompanied by mental reservations and requiring the dissolution of the group to which the emancipation is applied, is never a true emancipation. The Gentile protagonists of emancipation were not concerned with enabling the Jews to pursue more freely their Jewish interests. Their attitude to emancipation was motivated by the desire to assimilate Jewry. It took two forms, one among those Gentiles who had become skeptical of their own religious tradition, and another among orthodox adherents of various churches. To the former, Emancipation meant that Jews were thenceforth free to become Gentiles or "goyim," without having to become Christians. To the latter, it meant that Jews were thenceforth free to become "goyim" with the expectation that, before long, they would become Christians. Christian advocates of Emancipation argued that oppression of Jews antagonized them to Christianity and that their liberation would remove this antagonism and make them more amenable to Christian influence. But neither group looked upon the Emancipation as an affirmation of the right of Jews to existence, to living as Jews, as an identifiable historic group with interests and loyalties of its own, which it did not share with its Gentile neighbors.

The Fear to Be Jews

But the emancipation from medievalism, being only a spurious emancipation, has left the Jews with a feeling of dependence on the good-will of their liberators and a pervasive fear of forfeiting that good-will. It thus developed in the Jews a status that was a self-contradiction. They were free to be like their neighbors, but not free to differ from them; free to imitate but not to originate; free to conform but not free to dissent. Ahad Ha'am coined the classic phrase to describe this status. He called it *"avdut betok herut,"* the status of slavery in freedom. True, the Emancipation mitigated and, in some places, completely eliminated the fear of incendiarism, pogroms and expulsion. *But it developed in Jews a new fear, the fear of being Jews, the fear to live and act openly and collectively as Jews.*

For to be a Jew means to share in the corporate life of the Jewish people. It is as impossible to be a Jew without some form of corporate Jewish life as it is to be a soldier without an army. When Jews, therefore, are afraid to act as a group, they are afraid to be Jews. But the awareness that Jewish emancipation has been granted on the assumption that Jews would merge in the general popula-

tion and lose their identity has implanted that fear in the hearts of great numbers of Jews.

Thus in our day a new type of Jew has been developed, the Jew who is so fearful of disappointing the expectations of the Gentiles in regard to the eventual dissolution of Jewry that he does all he can to effect this end. He is not content, as were the assimilationists of the early Emancipation era, with seeking personal flight from Judaism via baptism or intermarriage; modern racialist anti-Semitism has barred that avenue of escape. Moreover, he is usually a man of sufficient human decency to feel a sense of responsibility to protect Jews like himself from physical extermination. He wants them to have the right to live as human beings, but he would rather that they cease living as Jews. He does not want the Jewish people exterminated, but he wants its life painlessly terminated. His Jewish program is a form of euthanasia, a painless death to the Jewish people as a corporate organism.

The technique of the euthanasian Jews is simple. They utilize whatever prestige they enjoy by reason of their social eminence, professional achievement and personal ability to dissuade Jews from gathering together for any open manifestation of collective Jewish interests. They make an exception of religion, because it is not respectable to be without any religion, but they show no enthusiasm whatsoever for the sanctities of Jewish religious tradition—the sabbaths and holy days, the Hebrew language and the literature of Torah, the ritual of the Jewish home, Palestine. Such religion as they profess is little more than a platitudinous humanitarianism, faintly colored by a vague theism. Jews may not organize to further common interests, if their doing so suggests that Jews have interests in common —interests, that is to say, which imply the desire of the Jewish people to continue living, and to resist euthanasia no less than violent extermination.

That is servility in freedom. That is the effect of being granted emancipation on the assumption that it will lead to assimilation. The fruit of emancipation is the servile desire to solve the Jewish problem by liquidating Judaism. The freedom won is the freedom *not* to be Jews. Some Jewish individuals may want that. But Jewry as a whole does not. Jews that are not spiritually enslaved want Judaism to be free to live, and not merely free to die a painless death.

In urging Jews to avoid expressing an interest in their group survival so as to facilitate the liquidation of the Jewish problem through the liquidation of the Jewish people, the euthanasians fail to realize one thing. Their purpose is bound to be frustrated by the very nature of anti-Semitism. For it is the function of anti-Semitism to implant in the Gentile mind the notion that Jews are an unassimilable corporate entity, a sort of parasitic social organism which the host body cannot tolerate. Anti-Semites therefore, resent the efforts of the Jewish people to merge with the rest of the population even more than they resent their desire to remain Jews. They no longer entertain the hope or expectation of the liberals of the Emancipation era that Jews will eventually disappear by being merged in the Gentile majority. Their desire is to exterminate, expel or segregate Jewry completely from contact with the Gentiles. From their point of view, assimilation is pollution, *Rassenschande*. The program of the euthanasians thus offers no rational means of escape from anti-Semitism. Though motivated by the desire for appeasement, it irritates rather than appeases the enemy.

When, in accordance with their program, euthanasian Jews organize anti-defamation leagues, committees and councils of various descriptions to combat

anti-Semitism, they cannot thereby nail the anti-Semitic lie of a Jewish conspiracy for world-domination. The very fact that they organize at all is held as evidence of the existence of collective Jewish interests, while their attempt to repudiate these interests is offered as evidence of the sinister secrecy and conspiratorial character of the Jewish communal bond. The anti-Semites know that they are masters, even though Jews who cherish the illusion of emancipation do not know that they are slaves.

Demand Freedom That Is Genuine

The only wise and honorable course for Jews to pursue under existing conditions is to demand that Jewish emancipation be made real and complete. Jews must be given the right not merely to live as human beings but to live as Jews; not merely to be accepted as loyal American citizens, but to be accepted as such without surrender of their right to be loyal Jews who have definite historic memories and hopes in common and legitimate common interests.

These considerations point to the need of widening the scope of the purpose for which the American Jewish Conference has been convened. It is not enough that the Conference express an interest in the future of Palestine and of European Jewry. Such an interest might be purely philanthropic and does not necessarily imply an affirmation of the right of the Jewish people to continue living as a collective social organism. Jews must meet the challenge of anti-Semitism by a frontal attack, since the anti-Semites have barred the effort to outflank it by way of assimilation. They must insist on the right of American Jewry, for example, openly and publicly to function as a corporate entity in any capacity which is legitimate from the standpoint of American law and institutions. The Conference should definitely repudiate a policy of *avdut betok herut,* of servility in freedom, by an act of self-emancipation. It must boldly and freely demand protection against anti-Semites, not only for the Jews of Europe and Palestine, but for the Jews of America and other democratic countries as well. And that protection must not be implicitly or explicitly conditioned on the willingness of the Jews to give up their identity either now or in some future time. This time it must be an emancipation *beyad ramah* "with high hand," "as of right and not on sufferance."

To be sure, such a right already exists and is implicit in the best traditions of American democracy. But since anti-Semitism also exists, that right must now be made explicit in the most unmistakable terms. If the right is to have any meaning, Jews are entitled to legislation that would effectively ban anti-Semitism. The abuse of free-speech by those who agitate for the denial of freedom to Jews or any other element of the American population calls for legal safeguards. Discrimination against Jews which makes it difficult for them to live without denying or concealing their Judaism must be abolished by law. The emancipation of Jewry from those conditions that render Jewish life unstable and insecure is a right which we shall never achieve, unless we act in the spirit of self-emancipation. *A test of our possessing the inward freedom to affirm our right to live as Jews is whether we have the courage to demand that anti-Semitism be outlawed.*

Demand the Outlawing of Anti-Semitism

In coming before the Peace Conference with the demand for freedom to be Jews without the constant menace of anti-Semitism, we would be asking no more than that the United Nations live up to what they have pledged in the Atlantic

Charter. No less important than freedom of worship is freedom from fear, and we have seen that anti-Semitism imposes on Jews the most demoralizing of fears, the fear to be their own true selves, to be loyal to the best that is in them.

In making out our case against anti-Semitism, we must recognize that it is of two kinds, secular and Christian. The secular anti-Semites hold us responsible for having given Christianity to the world; the Christian anti-Semites blame us for refusing to become Christians.

Secular anti-Semitism is a menace not only to the Jewish people but to the peace of the world. Wherever gangster politicians find it to their own advantage to confuse the minds of the people and to sow discord, in order to prepare the ground for usurpation and tyranny, anti-Semitism affords the best opportunity for doing so. Anti-Jewish prejudice has been so inculcated in the minds of most western peoples that it can easily be played upon by an unscrupulous demagogue for any sinister purpose whatsoever. The use that Hitler has made of anti-Semitism in his attempt to enslave the world was only the culmination of a process that began in Germany more than a century ago. One of the gravest problems that will confront the United Nations after the war will be the reconditioning of the German mind to render Germany capable of free cooperation with other nations in a free world. Part of that reconditioning must be the exorcism of the secular racialist anti-Semitism invoked by Hitler. Germany will not be totally disarmed until anti-Semitism, the weapon by which Hitler rose to power, has been broken. But the United Nations will not be able to effect this purpose, unless they themselves repudiate anti-Semitism by actually outlawing it.

For America itself is not immune against infection by the anti-Semitic virus. After the first World War, the lawlessness of the Ku Klux Klan was not unlike that of the Nazi party in its early days. In 1921, Woodrow Wilson, William Howard Taft, Cardinal O'Connell and 115 prominent Americans signed a proclamation which expressed their awareness of the danger of anti-Semitism to America. "The anti-Semitic publications," they declared, "are introducing into our national and political life a new dangerous spirit, one that is wholly at variance with our tradition and ideals and subversive of our system of government." Similar considerations led the British National Council for Civil Liberties, at a conference representing 273 organizations with more than a million members, which was held last April, to adopt a resolution asking the British government to introduce legislation outlawing anti-Semitism. The American Jewish Conference has therefore a clear case in any effort it may wish to make to combat the secular anti-Semitism of our day.

Our case against Christian anti-Semitism is no less convincing and potent. From its origin the Christian Church felt itself called upon to justify its repudiation of Judaism and its own pretensions to being the spiritual heir of the Prophets, the true "Israel," by villifying Judaism and the Jews as deicides. From the time of the Crucifixion, the role of the Jewish people in history, according to the orthodox Christian tradition, has been that of anti-Christ. Attention was called but recently to the fact that copies of the New Testament distributed among the armed forces of the United States contained a note which describes the Jewish people as "the Synagogue of Satan." In view of protests, the note will be deleted from future editions, but its insertion was no accident; it was no mere interpolation furtively made in the text by an individual Jew-baiter; it expressed a traditional interpretation of the New Testament passage to which it referred.

But if anti-Semitism is an integral part of the Christian religious tradition, that does not justify its retention in modern times. Anti-Semitism stands condemned by the conscience of decent Christians themselves, as the promise to delete the passage describing Jewry as "the synagogue of Satan" attests. Conrad Henry Moehlman, a leading Christian theologian, published a few years ago a book, *The Christian Jewish Tragedy,* devoted to an expose of the injustice that the Christian tradition has done to Judaism from its beginnings. The book is encouraging from yet another aspect, for it shows how inconsistent are the anti-Jewish tendencies of the Christian tradition with other teachings of Christianity. "This study," he says, in the concluding chapter of his book, "has added another count to the indictment against Christianity, namely, its failure adequately to confess its sin with reference to Israel. Fortunately, individual Christians are beginning to recognize this duty of repentance toward Israel." There follows a number of expressions of such a penitent attitude on the part of leading Christian clergymen, concluding with a statement signed by thirty Protestant leaders, which reads:

"We deplore the long record of wrongs from which the Jewish people have suffered in the past often from the hands of those who have professed the Christian faith and who have yet been guilty of acts utterly alien to Christian teaching and spirit.

"We declare our disavowal of anti-Semitism in every form and our purpose to remove by every available means its causes and manifestations in order that we may share with our fellow citizens of Jewish heritage, every political, educational, commercial, social and religious opportunity." (pp. 248-251).

The fact that the source of anti-Semitism is to be traced to the traditions of the Christian Church need not make us Jews squeamish about demanding that Christians join in the effort to ban anti-Semitism. Our government insisted on banning polygamy in Utah, before admitting it as a state into the federal union, although polygamy was sanctioned by the dominant religion of Utah's population, because polygamy was shocking to the moral sense of the American people. But surely anti-Semitism with its foundation in propagandist libels and its record of oppression, cruelty and violence is infinitely more immoral. Though Jew-hatred has, in the past, been a part of the doctrine of the Church, surely the Church will lose nothing and gain much from its repudiation of that hatred.

In the forthcoming American Jewish Conference, American Jews are given an opportunity of demonstrating the reality of their freedom, by a complete repudiation of "servility in freedom" and a complete affirmation of their right to continue living as Jews and pursuing every Jewish interest that the laws of America allow. They will miss that opportunity, if they limit their activities to the reconstruction of Jewish life in the European centers of Jewish population after the war, plus the finding of opportunities for resettlement of refugees in other lands and the reaffirmation of Jewish claims to Palestine. To these purposes must be added the demand that anti-Semitic agitation and discrimination against Jews on the ground of their Judaism must be made illegal throughout the world. Granted that legislative measures alone will not abolish the inveterate evil; nevertheless they are needed in order to tear the cloak of respectability from anti-Semitic agitation wherever it may exist and whatever form it may assume. But above all, it is necessary to save Jews from the craven fear of being Jews, to make them cease looking upon their emancipation as a

favor bestowed upon them by the Gentiles and make them claim it instead as a natural right involved in the right "to the pursuit of happiness." Then Jews will eventually achieve a status of true freedom and dignity; they will leave behind them not only the ghetto, but all the scars and blemishes with which the ghetto afflicted them, and they will go forth to a genuine emancipation, that acknowledges their right to their own peoplehood, "with a high hand." Only such emancipation can mean the freedom to be Jews.

Kelal Yisrael—A Democratic Concept

By ARIO S. HYAMS

Implications of a Democratic Religious Civilization

IF we wish to contribute to the conscious adjustment of Jewish law to present needs, we must see Judaism as a democratic, religious civilization. The crucial term in this statement is the word "democratic." But before we define it, we must understand some of the implications of the other term.

Judaism as a religious civilization carries with it a religious discipline. This discipline, like those of all other religious civilizations today, seeks to control and develop the behavior of those affiliated with it, beginning at a point where the civil law leaves off.

Like every other affiliation, *except* citizenship, membership in a religious civilization should be voluntary. The law of the land, especially in a democracy, but to a large extent under all forms of government, must gauge itself to a spiritual standard no higher, and very often much lower, than the highest common spirtual denominator of the population. Affiliation with a religious discipline implies a dissatisfaction with this minimum culture, ethic and morality and a desire to associate oneself with a group which has higher ideals than those enforcible by the civil law. The members of such a group are not compelled to continue their affiliation by any police force. It may be assumed, therefore, that they are willing to sacrifice much of their comfort and convenience to testify to the validity of their ideals.

Like every other affiliation, *including* citizenship, membership in such a civilization must be active. In citizenship, passive membership is parasitical. Active participation is, therefore, when necessary, enforced by the police according to the law. In other affiliations, the only reasonable evidence of membership is active participation. Since affiliation is voluntary, there can be no compulsion for a maximum participation. But since only a maximum participation can be expected to produce any recognizable benefits from the discipline involved, a minimum activity must be ineffective, wasteful and unsatisfactory. Passive membership and minimum activity, therefore, defeat themselves.

If this religious discipline takes up from where the civil law leaves off, it must be expected to influence our behavior in all spheres of living. It must include our private lives as well as our public lives. It must prescribe ritual and study as well as ethics and morality. A religious discipline, which omits any one of these aspects, must be considered incomplete.

Relation of Ritual and Ethics in Religion

For purposes of theory, the classification of religious disciplines into the categories of ritual and ethical may be convenient. Even theoretically, however, we must not insist too much on the separation of these categories. In the first place, the line of demarcation, as in the case of some of the laws of marriage and divorce, is extremely fine and rather arbitrary. In the second place, our acceptance of the definition of Judaism as a civilization should incline us to see its various aspects as organically interrelated, rather than as separated into air-tight compartments.

It is true that the prophets attacked some rituals in order to exalt ethics. But they attacked ritual only to prove that changes in the Jewish civilization were necessary and right. Their primary attack was against the moral and ethical evils of their day. So effective was their struggle for ethical and moral reform, and so secondary was their attack on ritual, that their successors, the Pharisees, developed a way of life in which both ritual and ethics went hand in hand.

Furthermore, the prophets attacked specific rituals in order also to attack specific ethical evils. I doubt that they had in mind the relative merits of these two general categories. They were merely protesting the general devotion to these rituals and the general neglect of justice and righteousness. They lived in a civilization where every element was integrated in the whole social set-up, and they wanted to use the popular loyalty to ritual as a lever by which to raise their civilization to higher ethical standards.

Objection to Stressing Distinction Between Ritual and Ethical Rules

If, even in theory, the distinction between these two categories can be carried too far, from the practical point of view to stress it is even more objectionable. Aside from the permanent values, these two categories have at least one temporary and practical value. Ritual strengthens the social body of a group, while ethics and morality strengthen its spirit. To make one inferior to the other is to introduce a dichotomy between body and soul which is foreign to our world outlook. In attacking some of the most important rituals of their day, the prophets did not endanger the Jewish social body, because the Jews were still on their own land. During the Exile, on the other hand, prophecy needed an Ezekiel to reenforce its message with the strength of ritual.

Today we must learn not so much from Isaiah as from Ezekiel. Our attacks on ritual will not result in greater efforts on behalf of ethical reform. The modern Reform Movement in Judaism is sufficient evidence of that. Today the attack on ritual merely weakens the Jewish social body. The opposite is now necessary. In order to marshal the forces of a society in support of ethical reforms, one must appeal to the highest and best in the social personality of the group. And while ritual represents neither the highest and best, nor the lowest and worst, it certainly does represent, more than anything else in its civilization, the uniqueness of the social personality. Weakening that personality will only weaken whatever support we may get from it for any ethical reform.

This should not be understood as a plea for the indiscriminate preservation of all ritual. It is merely an attempt to point out that both ritual and ethics are parts of the Jewish civilization. Our disgust with some rituals should not impel us to place the whole category of ritual in an inferior position. We must recognize the importance of ritual observance not only

in principle, but also in practice. The distinction between ethics and ritual should not be exaggerated. Both categories are voluntary disciplines, maximum active participation in which is essential for membership in the Jewish religious civilization. Both are binding on all Jews as categories. And both need vision for their further development.

The Term "Law" in Connection with Ritual

Because both categories, ritual and ethical, are so closely intertwined, I do not think that anything will be gained in discarding the term "law" in connection with ritual. Civil law makes no distinction between the categories. Nobody argues about what side of the road to drive on, and other such instances which lie on the borderline between ethics and ritual in civil law. It is all considered "law." Assuming that all religious discipline, as distinguished from civil discipline, is voluntary, one either applies the term "law" to both categories or abolishes the whole concept of religious law.

Much can be said for keeping the term "law" for all religious discipline. For it too, like civil law, carries with it a kind of compulsion. It is the force of one's loyalty and respect for his religious civilization. Its effectiveness and inclusiveness vary, of course, with the individual, depending upon the degree of his dissatisfaction with a completely non-religious life, and of his attraction to the civilization with which he is affiliated. But to deny the existence of this force in Jewish life is to deny that Judaism has any claim upon us. If, therefore, there is any validity to Jewish life, there must be a force which will command our observance of its law, both ritual and ethical. The fact tht this is a force whihc is quite different from that exerted by the civil law does not preclude our use of the same term. Just as we talk about "obedience to God" as a duty, in quite a different sense from the compulsory "obedience to tyrants," so we should talk about "obedience to Jewish law (ethical and ritual)" as a duty for Jews, though that obdience is different from that which sustains the "law of the land."

Democracy in the Evolution Of Jewish Law

How can Jewish law be adjusted? I think that the key to the answer may be found in the definition of Judaism as "the religious civilization of *Kelal Yisrael* (Catholic Israel)." It is no accident that both these concepts, that of "Judaism as a religious civilization" and that of "Catholic Israel," received their greatest and most effective emphasis from the followers of the so-called school of "Historical Judaism." Implicit, though not yet developed, in the principles of this "school" is an appreciation of the historical development of the Jewish civilization, not from the top down but from the bottom up. The Jewish civilization may be considered the distillation of the experiences of the Jewish people through the ages, thus making it a civilization "of, by and for *Kelal Yisrael.*"

No civilization is the creation solely of its geniuses. All civilizations are rather the creations of the cultural and spiritual hinterland from which these geniuses drew their nourishment. Yet, in spite of the fact that all civilizations were democratically created, they did not all become in themselves democratic. Judaism, however, both in the process of its creation and in its resultant product, is the religious civilization of all Israel. This is not to say that all Jews are active participants in Jewish ethical and ritual disciplines to a maximum degree, any more than we can say that all ancient Jews were prophets. But the fact that the Tal-

mud insists that they were at least "sons of prophets" shows that Jewish tradition founded prophetic inspiration on a democratic basis. This spiritual creativity of *Kelal Yisrael* as a unit was noted by others too. The Greek philosophers are the greatest in the history of the world; yet the Greeks called the Jews a "nation of philosophers." Mohammed wrote a book too; but he is said to have called, not the Mohammedans, but the Jews "the people of the Book." Judaism is not only a result of democratic creativity; it is, in its very essence, a democratic, religious civilization.

There is a school of thought in Conservative Judaism which speaks in theory of "Catholic Israel" but which, because of its neglect of the principle of "Judaism as a civilization," goes for its method for the adjustment of Jewish law not to Israel but to its geniuses. It advocates the formulation of a philosophy of Jewish law and an analysis of its principles, so that experts may be guided in making the necessary adjustments in the law. Such a project is highly desirable. We need the scholarship it would foster. We need the leadership it would produce. In my opinion, however, it bears the stamp of an unprogressive Conservatism rather than that of the "Historical School" from which the Conservative Movement is supposed to have sprung. Such a study of Jewish law will certainly be a desirable addition to the various departments of the "Science of Judaism." But to envision it as anything more than a source of information is highly unrealistic. By neglecting the all-inclusive and organic character of Judaism as the "civilization of *Kelal Yisrael,*" it can only develop into an attempt to bind the present to the past at the expense of the future.

The Technique Of Change

I think it will be generally conceded that traditional Judaism viewed Jewish life as directed, not by the Written Law, but by the Oral Law, that adjustment was part of the process of living and not something to be completed once and for all. This Oral Law consisted to a large extent of differing practices and opinions which made not for disunity but rather for unity. At the close of every period of development or at the time of a crisis, the past was recorded. As a matter of fact, the conclusion of a period of Jewish history is marked by the change of an Oral Tradition into a written record. The new period and the new adjustments began immediately, and they did not wait for the formulation of a philosophy of law based on previous decisions. The result in every case was that *some outstanding aspect of the past was dispensed with.* Though much or most of the past was still carried, what followed was necessarily a *new* method of developing the Oral Law, since an essential characteristic of the past was being omitted. The only guarantee they had that they would succeed in making the necessary adjustment was their faith in the continued existence of the Jewish people.

This technique of change dispensed successively with prophecy, legislation, free interpretation, judicial interpretation and *herem.* This involved no disrespect for the past. On the contrary, by pronouncing the outstanding characterisitc of the past as *too sacred* for the use of their own inferior generation, they gave it decent burial. When prophecy was dispensed with, the *bat kol* was not obeyed any more. Today we might dispense with *pilpul* or some other characteristic of the past which induces us to multiply legal fictions in Jewish law. But whatever it is that we would discard, it must be *some characteristic hitherto deemed essential.* Otherwise the method will not be effective. In other words, what we must

discard is probably what scholars will insist on our keeping.

What then can preserve the continuity of the Jewish civilization? Only the reorganization of the Jewish people and the responsiveness of our trained scholars to the needs of the people can make the readjustment of Jewish law a continuation of the past. The present must be different enough from the past to enable it to live in the future, and those who would contribute to that future must evince a faith that the vitality of the Jewish people will carry it through the change. A present that is too close to the past lives out of its context; it cannot survive transposition into the future.

I believe that the transmutation of the "Historical School" into a "Conservative Movement" is temporary. The Conservative Movement is serving an important purpose in permitting us to learn more of the status quo of Jewish law at first hand, a status quo that we love very dearly. But in spite of all nostalgic yearning for the old days, "history" will have its way. Jewish law, to save itself, will call in the coercive power implicit in the Jewish organism. There will, there must emerge a well-defined Jewish social group. This group will bear the burden of the adjustment of Jewish law.

If any analogy is to be found between Jewish law and civil law, it is not in the American Constitution, but in the English. Jewish law will be revised not by the doctors of the law who will lock themselves in "the four ells of halakhah" but by those who will say: "Go out and see how the people act." Our rabbis will not be law-makers. They will be leaders, organizing Jewish life, guiding it, drawing the best out of the people's experiences and submitting their studies to the judgment of *Kelal Yisrael.*

I think we can agree on what we want the Judaism of the future to be like. I do not think anybody can foresee what it will develop into. I think that the way to make our efforts, our desires and our results most effective is to organize Jewish life. In those spheres of Jewish living where such organization will be accomplished, a vital, fluid Oral Law will grow up. In those realms of Jewish living where no appreciable organization will succeed, all talk of Jewish law is bound to be academic. Whatever there will be of Jewish law will be carried on by a voluntary, active membership, subjecting itself to a democratically organized discipline, both ritual and ethical, allowing for a variety of opinion and a gradation of observance, and united by a faith in the immortality of the Jewish people, nourished by "a love and friendship which opposing parties will bear for each other in accordance with the verse: 'therefore love ye truth and peace.' "

LORD NATHAN ON THE DISSOLUTION OF THE COMINTERN

(*Continued from Page* 6)

forms of nationalism which respect the dignity of the human personality.

The kind of nationalism which rules out Judaism—or the World Jewish Congress—may suit Lord Nathan; but it does not suit us, and, thank God, it does not suit the Supreme Court of the United States. A momentous decision rendered a few days ago on the case of the Jehovah's Witnesses testifies to the profound faith which the Court has in the inherent worth of American nationalism, and the respect it has for religious groups which invoke an authority higher than the state.

The Lord Nathans and their followers should note that there are nationalisms *and* nationalisms, internationalisms *and* internationalisms. The Comintern is dead; long live the peaceful, creative, beneficent internationalisms!

The Synagogue From a Pedagogic Viewpoint

By HARRY ELKIN*

SPEAK to the average Jew and ask him what is wrong with the services and why he does not attend them more often, and he will tell you very frankly, "The service is too long; it is too monotonous," or, "it's the same thing, week in and week out." Ask the man who came to the High Holy Day Services, for whom this attendance was the first and last of the year, ask him whether he derived any inspiration from them and whether he would not perhaps drop in again during the year. "Who, me?", he shoots back at you. "Once a year is enough for me. Why I couldn't even last this one time; went out during the middle. It gets boring after a while. Besides, the prayers don't mean anything to me." The problem for many Jews is as alarmingly simple as all that.

It would be quite understandable if this type of reaction were to be found only among the ignorant or the atheistic Jews, but, alas, one meets with this response in the circles of men and women who have received excellent Jewish training and for whom synagogue attendance has been a devotion of love throughout childhood and adolescence.

There must be something basically wrong with the synagogue service approach. When "going to shul" was a duty eagerly observed by every man, woman and child in Israel, then whatever procedures or rituals constituted the services were acceptable to all, nay, definitely expected. Any minute deviation therefrom was met with severe condemnation. But in our day, when synagogue attendance is a matter of personal preference, we must search for those elements that command the full interest of the average Jewish layman.

The Need of Variety

The average person is stimulated by an approach which is characterized by variety, freshness and imaginativeness. Would eighty million people go to the movies every week if the film began and ended the same way and developed along uniform patterns? A new story, new actors, new surprise factors bring the moviegoers back to the box-office every Saturday night. Would the theatre lover attend first nights with the zeal and enthusiasm that he does, if he knew that each time the curtain went up there would appear before him the same scenes, plot development and acting technique? No, he sits at the edge of his seat at each opening, consumed with a feeling of great expectancy and excitement, knowing full well that soon a new world will unfold before his eyes, a world of new people and new ideas. And if not, well, the next day's theatre page will certainly carry the obituary notice.

But, it will be argued, the synagogue service is not and should not be designed to provide entertainment and thrills. True, indeed. It has a much bigger job than that to perform. It must provide a "spiritualizing and culturalizing" influence in the life of the average Jew whose entire week is dedicated to money-making and card-playing. It must do it every week, not just occasionally, and it must compete with so many extremely attractive distractions. Surely this most important and difficult objective cannot be achieved by following a deadening routine and an uninteresting approach. There

*Educational Director, Jewish Community Center, Allentown, Pa.

must be variety, daring newness, challenge in every nuance of synagogue ritual to command and hold the attention of the congregants.

Let us apply the measuring rod of human interest to synagogue procedures and content. We must admit that, in the majority of synagogues, there has been a freezing of ritual and routine which has been going on since the time we attended services as children. Within our lifetime few fundamental changes have taken place aside from such external improvements as better decorum, mixed pews, English responses and finer music. Most Sabbath and holiday services still begin the same way, end the same way and somewhere along the middle there is the reading of the Torah and the sermon. The only real innovation in recent times is the late Friday Evening Service, and even here the routines have already become monotonously set for at least a full decade.

Thus the basic patterns of synagogue procedures are mostly intact and, what is even more undesirable, so many prayers have been retained which have lost significance for the modern Jew. It is not at all unusual to find that the placing of the prayerbook in translation before the American Jew has wrought havoc with many a man's attitude toward the entire service.

Essentially, I would say, then, that the first prerequisite for a compelling service which would stimulate the hearts and minds of our Jews is *the presence of change and variety of approach as a basic and regular element* in the weekly service, be it the Friday evening service, the Saturday morning or the Holiday service. The worshiper must never be given the opportunity to relax in his seat and let his mind wander off because he is familiar, through a thousand repetitions, with the prayers, procedures and music. There is nothing sacred about synagogue procedures *per se*. We have already taken many liberties with the ritual and we should be prepared to take many more if we are to rescue the service from the monotonous patterns it has fallen into.

Each Service A New Experience

The synagogue service has always been a vehicle for religious education and study. At least the Rabbis intended it to be so, as is indicated by their inclusion of portions from the Bible, Mishnah and Gemara in the daily prayerbook. If we are to continue to make the services an opportunity for inspiring instruction, then they must become flexible and charged with vividness and imaginativeness. Each service should be a new experience and a new challenge for the modern Jew and should be completely different from the one that preceded it if it is to stir and upset his thinking and feeling. This will call for alertness, originality and resourcefulness on the part of the religious leader. The stimulation resulting from such an approach will work both ways, both upon the dispenser and the recipient. Does not the successful and effective teacher do that very thing in his classroom? He can never hope to hold the attention of his charges each day if he does not change continually his methods of teaching and find new ideas and new approaches. And why should the Rabbi, who is essentially a religious educator but at a much more difficult task of education, expect to accomplish his ends with less?

All types of educational endeavor, formal schooling, adult studies, recreational activities, informal education and group work, have shifted their emphasis from formal, passive procedures to creative, dynamic experiences. This is nothing new; it has been going on for a long time.

Workers in all these fields have discarded the routinized approach to all activities, whether it be the dramatic club, the discussion forum, or the club program. The synagogue, which should be the most potent force for adult Jewish education at all times, must do likewise. The synagogue must seek ways of making the congregation less passive, more vocal, at the service proper. The approach will have to be, as in other spheres of educational work, one of creative varied activity. Stereotyped procedure, deadly routine, which go on year after year, cannot possibly arouse and inspire congregants.

Suggestions for Improving Friday Evening Services

Today, with the Friday Evening Service as the main Judaic lifeline to the average Jew, everything must be done to make that lifeline bear all the ingredients of a more or less full Jewish life—study, prayer, ethics, Jewish History, tradition and law, inspiration and guidance. Now, if we accept the Reconstructionist philosophy of "Judaism as a Civilization," then the possibilities for making each service a vital spiritual experience are unlimited. Fully to concretize this discussion, I am listing below a number of suggestions, of which each, individually, may be subject to criticism, but all, as a whole, aim toward a revitalization of the synagogue service.

1. The Friday evening service may start with an opening prayer after which the rabbi gives his sermon. At the conclusion of the sermon the congregation discusses the sermon and asks questions. If the sermon is on a Jewish subject worthy of further examination — and it should be—an excellent opportunity is afforded the people to engage in a half hour of discussion and study, the congregation feels it has had a share in the service.

The service may then be concluded with the Kiddush and an appropriate Sabbath hymn.

2. If the service is dedicated to some special theme, such as, Peace Day, Mothers' Day or A.Z.A. Sabbath, then the entire service should be different from the previous ones. Not merely the sermon, but the prayers, recitations and responses should be related to the immediate subject. This may call for the introduction of prayers from new and modern sources and, since the prayerbooks are not fully adequate for this type of service, attractive little booklets would have to be mimeographed or printed for each special occasion.

3. Original prayers and recitations related to Judaism, or perhaps to personal experiences of joy or sadness should be encouraged at the services. Men, women, children and young people should be stimulated to write their own selections which should be read by the authors at appropriate points in the service. Here again the congregation will feel it is shaping the course of the service through its own experiences and thoughts, and a new spontaneity and freshness will be added.

4. One Friday Evening Service might be dedicated from time to time to various kinds of Jewish music. One service might be a Palestinian Music Service; another might consist of Chanukah Festival songs. A few songs would be sung by a trained choir, some played by the organist, if there is an organ, and still others, the more popular ones, be sung by the congregation. There is available a fine library of religious musical recordings which can also be brought into use. The sermon of the rabbi might deal with the content and originality of each of the songs, or, he might introduce each song as it is sung. In general, an Organ Recital of Religious or Festival Music will always prove inspiring and satisfying.

5. On Sabbaths when the portion of the Torah is pregnant with possibilities for instruction and inspiration, the Rabbi might devote the entire Friday evening service to the reading and the study of the text in English. With copies of the Jewish Publication Society Bible in their hands the congregation cannot but feel it is partaking of Jewish learning in the inspiring atmosphere of the syngagoue and together with many other Jewish men and women. The beautiful chapters on Jacob, Joseph, Moses can certainly be an adequate substitute for the usual service, and so can the chapters of Mishpatim and Kedoshim with their lofty ideals.

6. Occasionally, in place of the sermon, a few members of the congregation may present a dramatization of some Jewish theme or biblical portion. A spiritual message can often be conveyed more effectively via a simple dramatic presentation. Here again the congregation are given the opportunity to be active participants in the service and not merely passive listeners.

7. The *Bet Hakeneset* should often be turned into a *Bet Hamidrash*. The reading and the study of the Perek should prove from time to time a worthwhile and inspiring way of spending the Sabbath eve. The reading of the Book of Ruth, Jonah, or selections from other portions of the Bible, on appropriate occasions, would constitute another Friday evening service. Our Jewish men and women hear so much *about* these texts that actually seeing and holding the original in their hands would be a refreshing experience. Naturally, appropriate prayers would open and close the service.

These suggestions are but a few and merely serve to indicate the direction in which we should travel. Once this principle of *variety of approach* is accepted the possibilities are limitless. Many new and better techniques will be discovered to arouse the modern Jew out of his lethargy.

In these days, when we hear so much frank discussion about the inability of the modern Jew to pray and about attendance at synagogue as a price to be paid for listening to a good sermon, bold and resourceful plans will have to be adopted to restore the service to its original preeminence. We cannot go on for long knowing that there exists a feeling among many Jews that the service is just the other side of the record one must listen to each week.

Is the Hebrew Language Indispensable To Judaism?

By LOUIS BARISH*

We have, from time to time, published articles on the place of the Hebrew language in Jewish education and Jewish life. The article here presented takes issue with most of the views previously expressed. We publish it as a lucid statement of its own standpoint, but our doing so must not be construed as an endorsement of the author's opinions. —EDITORS.

THERE is a serious controversy in the field of elementary Jewish education today over the place of the Hebrew language in the curriculum of the Jewish school. Some Jewish educators argue that the Hebrew language is indispensable to the survival of the Jewish people in America and to the

*Rabbi, Congregation Beth Sholom, Kilgore, Texas.

continuation of Judaism as a religio-cultural phenomenon. The proponents of this view, therefore, insist on the "centrality of Hebrew." They take the position that the study and mastery of the Hebrew language is the most important objective of the whole educational program, that no Jewish education which omits or fails to recognize the supremacy of the traditional language of the Jewish people can be an adequate program of Jewish religious education.

These educators are not satisfied with the mere inclusion of Hebrew as a subject in the curriculum of the elementary Hebrew school. They maintain that the Hebrew language must enjoy a place of centrality and that all the other subjects which make up the curriculum or are clamoring for admission to the curriculum are only secondary. The study of Hebrew must, according to this view, be the core or heart of the course of study. Thus, most of the time spent by the child in school, all of it if necessary, must be devoted to the study of the Hebrew language and its literature in the original tongue. Dr. Chomsky who is the most articulate exponent of this view expresses it as follows:

"Jewish parents who are at all concerned about the survival of Judaism, of Jewish values and modes of living have always felt intuitively that a knowledge of Hebrew is essential and that its study is an indispensable element in the scheme of Jewish education. . . . Hebrew is not just a subject like history, current events, religion and so on. All these subjects are important elements in our curriculum. They make for completeness and rounding out of the Jewish educational process. But Hebrew is the nerve-center of the Jewish curriculum. It vitalizes and reinforces all the other subjects. Without it these subjects are merely so much information stored away and memorized, which in the course of time is gradually forgotten, leaving in the mind stray and desultory bits of facts and data. To construct a Jewish curriculum around these subjects without Hebrew is largely to build on quicksand. No real educational results in terms of personality changes may be expected from such a Jewish curriculum. Such a curriculum is at best a makeshift and at worst dangerous self-deception. The knowledge of Hebrew is a *sine qua non* for a full integration into Jewish living and experiencing." (William Chomsky, "The Hebrew Language in the Jewish Curriculum." *The Reconstructionist,* Vol. 8 No. 3.)

Other educators feel that the Hebrew language is important to the creative functioning of Judaism but that it is not absolutely indispensable. On the exact nature of its importance there is naturally a wide diversity of opinion. Some would go so far as to say that the study of it must be relegated to a rather minor position in Jewish elementary education because of the need to devote more time to the study of other religious and cultural subjects which are of a more crucial nature and of more immediate importance to the child.

Dr. Golub, who is a spokesman for one of the streams of thought taking a middle course, states his position as follows: "Hebrew is essential as one of the elements symbolic of Jewish unity. We Jews are a world-scattered people whose attributes of nationality are more symbolic than real. We have a land that is, as yet, mainly a symbol of a homeland, though it is a much more concrete symbol today than it was fifty years ago. Our language likewise is a much more concrete symbol today. Nevertheless, intrinsically, it is still a symbol rather than a language in real use. Every child must know some Hebrew, even if it be no more than a few Hebrew prayers which he should learn to read

and to understand. Beyond that, the symbol becomes as valuable as it can be concretized. The more Hebrew a child can learn, the stronger will be his bond to Jewish life, but first he must happily, or at least willingly, identify himself with it. . . . Hebrew is one of the important studies but instruction in Jewish living must first be given to children in a language that they understand." (Jacob S. Golub, "Jewish and Hebrew Education." *The Reconstructionist,* Vol. 7 No. 16).

Rabbi Harry Essrig, Director of B'nai B'rith Hillel Foundation at the University of Chicago, goes much further than Dr. Golub in his estimation of the place of the Hebrew language in Jewish education. In a very penetrating paper on "The Dynamics of Jewish Culture," he points out that far too much emphasis has been placed until now on the linguistic form rather than on the cultural content. "Our efforts to lay upon youngsters a linguistic yoke, which proved at times to be skin-chafing and irksome, has probably contributed more than any other factor toward the fostering of negative concomitant attitudes toward an unpleasant association with Judaism. Completely enslaved to their emotional attachments and stricken with a pathetic nostalgia for spiritual worlds that have literally passed away, our educators lightly dismissed the central question of the utility and function of a language. Does it derive significance from its serviceableness as a bearer of ideas in a medium common to a given number of individuals? Or is its survival as a literary vehicle intrinsically worthwhile enough to become an end in itself? The implications inherent in the choice of alternatives were not carefully drawn nor analyzed systematically. Consequently not sufficient cognizance was taken of the overwhelming assimilative tendencies operating in our milieu which doomed any large-scale transmission of Jewish values in their original expression, be it Hebrew or Yiddish, to continuous frustration. Instead, a halo of asnctity was cast over the failing body of the Hebrew language and many continued to approach it with an emotional quiver, in a spirit of awe and trepidation, as though it were the embodiment of some mystical qualities without which our people would be hopelessly stranded in the world babble of tongues. . . . The rich abundance from our cultural past was allowed to rot and decay by the wayside as we plodded on fantastically along the accustomed and tedious highways of linguistic instruction. When called to task for the high mortality rate resulting from such stubborn perseverance, our intellectual spokesmen uttered abstract phrases about 'translation being equivalent to kissing a bride through veils' and gave vent to metaphysical nonsense which betrayed their inability to cope with the unprecedented tasks of the contemporary era." (Harry Essrig, "The Dynamics of Jewish Culture," *The Reconstructionist,* Vol. 7, No. 7.)

Essrig comes closest to the third position, that taken by those who would call for the complete elimination of the Hebrew language. There are educators, especially those of the radical Reform group, who look upon the Hebrew language as a vestigial relic from the Jewish nationalism of the past and maintain, therefore, that there is no room for the study of it in a program of Jewish "religious" education.

In short, there seem to be three main views taken on the question of what should be the place of the Hebrew language in the school of Jewish education. First, that Hebrew is absolutely indispensable and should receive a place of centrality; second, that the study of the Hebrew language is important but that it is

not absolutely indispensable and should occupy a position commensurate with its importance among the other subjects in the curriculum; third, it should be completely extirpated from the curriculum and any time expended in its study and acquisition is a total waste of energy and even a detriment to the cause of Jewish religious education.

The arguments advanced by the proponents of these three views have been stated in the educational literature, but no attempt has been made to examine their validity in objective terms although such a study would constitute an important contribution toward meeting a very grave problem in Jewish education. The crux of the question is: How necessary, if at all, is the Hebrew language to the Jewish people in America and to the survival of Judaism as a religio-cultural phenomenon? In what respects would Judaism suffer by the elimination of Hebrew, and to what extent would Judaism be enhanced by the wholehearted cultivation and intensive study of the Hebrew language?

A study is needed which will formulate and analyze the meaning and implications of the arguments found in the literature of the proponents of these three views and test the validity of the arguments with the best available data in the fields of anthropology, linguistics, sociology and history.

I propose in this paper to consider only one of the arguments or issues involved in this all-important controversy, the contention that Hebrew is necessary as a mark of Jewish otherness.

The Argument for Hebrew As Essential to Otherness

The proponents of the indispensability of the Hebrew language contend that the Jews need the Hebrew language in order to preserve the specific character of Judaism. Distinctiveness or otherness in group life, they say, is measured largely by the presence of a unique language. If Judaism is to continue to function as a distinctive culture, it must have a distinctive language. Grecian culture needed Greek, Roman culture needed Latin and Hebrew or Jewish culture needs Hebrew.

The community of Israel must have its own common language even though the language of the country of citizenship, (i.e. English here in America) must, perforce, be the ordinary medium for intercourse. A language is preeminently the distinctive mark of a civilization and gives a people individuality. It enables the individuals composing a nation, a race or a religio-culture group (such as the Jews are) to enter into communication with one another. At the same time, it develops in each a consciousness of his people as distinct from other peoples—or of his people's otherness.

Whereas a common land is an indispensable condition of a civilization, a common language is an indispensable vehicle of a civilization. Every language is a storehouse of a particular cluster of ideas and experiences which are common to the members of the group and distinguish it from other groups. Therefore, the Jewish people cannot afford to surrender or neglect its language, Hebrew, an indispensable, distinctive mark of its civilization and culture. Moreover, Jewry needs a distinctive channel for self-expression, a language of its own, in order to preserve its specific character and to perpetuate its otherness.

The above arguments assume that a unique group must have a unique language and that a unique group cannot retain its distinctiveness very long once it has been forced to surrender its unique language, or surrenders it willingly. It

presupposes that there is some intimate and inextricable causal relationship between the group and its language and between the culture and the language.

Need for Scientific Analysis of Problem

The man in the street does not stop to analyze scientifically his position in the general scheme of humanity. He vaguely regards himself as a member of some strongly integrated portion of mankind —now thought of as a nationality, now as a "race," now as a religious or cultural group—and that all things that pertain to him as a typical member of this group somehow belong together. If he is an Englishman, he feels himself to be a member of the Anglo-Saxon race, the genius of which has fashioned the English language and has produced the Anglo-Saxon culture, of which the language is an expression. This sentiment is characteristic also of the Jew who is consciously Jewish. He feels that he is part of the Jewish group which has fashioned the Hebrew language, and developed a unique Hebrew culture, of which the Hebrew language is a natural historical expression and its indispensable medium of communication. Insofar as this is characteristic of the psychology of the individual and his attitude toward the group to which he belongs, the group language does create in him a consciousness of his belonging and of his group's otherness. It would not be correct to argue, however, that the Hebrew language is indispensable in order that the Jew may experience this feeling of his people's otherness unless it can be demonstrated that there is some definite causal relation between the Hebrew language and Jewish culture or the Jewish group. Nor would it be correct to assume that the Jew needs the Hebrew language in order to preserve the specific character of Judaism unless it can be definitely established that a positive correlation between language and culture does exist and that the uniqueness or distinctiveness of one cannot be maintained without the maintenance of the other.

In order to determine whether a unique language or how far a single language is essential to the maintenance of a strong creative and distinctive Jewish group life, it will be necessary first to discover what is the exact nature of Jewish group life and then to consider whether a unique language is indispensable to the perpetuation of that particular type of group. Any attempt to answer the second part of this difficult question will naturally start with an inquiry into what has happened in the past to groups which were compelled by circumstances to surrender their own language or did so willingly, adopting that of a superior culture or of their conquerors. It will then be necessary to consider whether there are any new factors in the modern world that have to be reckoned with, since such factors, had they been operative in the past, might have changed the situation, and might, in the present, alter the consequences of the loss or surrender of a unique language.

It would be an exceedingly difficult problem to determine the exact character of the Jewish group today and it is not my intention to undertake it in this study. For our purposes here it is sufficient to assume that the Jewish group falls under either one of such classifications as nationality, race, religion, culture or some combination of them. Thus it will be necessary to examine the role of language and its relationship to each one of these types of social organism, in order to determine whether there is any ground for the claim that Hebrew is indispensable to the survival of the Jewish group.

Language and Race Not Correlated

Anthropologists have been in the habit of studying man under the three rubrics of race, language and culture. They inquire whether these three types of classification—racial, linguistic and cultural—are congruent, whether their association is an inherently necessary one or merely a matter of external history. The answer to this question is not encouraging to the exponents of the indispensability of the Hebrew language. Historians and anthropologists find that races, languages and cultures are not distributed in parallel fashion, that their areas of distribution intercross in the most bewildering manner and that the history of each is apt to follow a distinctive course. On the other hand, languages may spread far beyond their original homes, invading the territory of new races and of new cultural spheres. A language may even die out in its primary area and live on among peoples violently hostile to the persons of its original speakers and their culture. Further, the accidents of history are constantly rearranging the borders of culture areas without necessarily effacing the existing linguistic cleavages. We are informed by no less an authority than Sapir that a group of languages need not in the least correspond to a racial group or to a cultural area. (Sapir—"Language," Ch. X, "Language, Race and Culture," Gray: "Foundations of Language," p. 117, "Language and Society.") We may even show how a single language intercrosses with race and culture lines. (See Franz Boaz: "Handbook of American Indian Languages," Vol. I, for proof of this point.) The English language, for example, is not spoken by a unified race. In the United States millions of Negroes know no other language. It is their mother tongue, the formal vesture of their inmost thoughts and sentiments. It is inalienably theirs. Yet there are Negroes in other parts of the world who do not speak the English language. The English-speaking peoples are themselves an amalgam of many distinct strains which manage to perpetuate their distinctiveness although they share a common medium of expression in the English language. Not only is English not spoken by a unified race but its prototype was originally a foreign language to the race with which English is more particularly associated. English, or the group of languages to which it belongs, is in no sense the expression of race or of the group from which it evolved.

Relation of Language To Culture

As with race, so with culture. Wherever the secondarily unifying power of the "national" ideal, says Sapir, does not arise to disturb the flow of what we might call the natural distribution, it is easy to show that language and culture are not intrinsically associated. In an area dominated by the national sentiment there is a tendency for language and culture to become uniform and specific, so that linguistic and cultural boundaries tend to coincide. As Prof. Gray points out, language is an important element in creating and enhancing a consciousness of community; the possession of a common language, as of a common religion, of a common type of civilization, of common economic interests, etc., is a powerful factor in creating a feeling of community just as differences in these regards give rise to a feeling of disunity. But neither unity of race nor unity of language is inherently necessary for such consciousness. This is strikingly demonstrated by Switzerland which is inhabited by people speaking French, German, Italian and Rhaeto-Romanic, all four officially recognized as of equal standing.

But Switzerland is indubitably a state and a nation with a strong national consciousness. We may draw the conclusion from this evidence that a unique language does enhance the individual's consciousness of his affiliation with a unique group and his sense of belonging in a unique stream of culture, but there is nothing indispensable or causal about this relationship. As a matter of fact, unrelated languages may share in one culture and closely related languages—even a single language—may belong to more than one distinct and unique cultural sphere or group.

Thus it would appear that the Hebrew language as the unique historical language of the Jewish people and of the Jewish culture of which it is a vehicle of expression can serve to strengthen the group awareness of the Jew but that awareness can be kept alive without the perpetuation of the language. It is certainly not necessary for the survival of the unique character of Jewish culture.

The community of language between Great Britain and the United States is far from arguing a like community of culture. It is customary to say that they possess a common "Anglo-Saxon" cultural heritage but the many significant differences in life and feeling are obscured by the tendency to take this common heritage too much for granted. America is only colonially and vestigially English. Its prevailing cultural drift is toward autonomous and distinctive development. We cannot deny that the possession of a common language is still, and will long continue to be, a smoother of the way to a mutual cultural understanding between England and America, but it is also very clear that other factors are operating powerfully to counteract this linking influence. "A common language," in Sapir's words, "cannot indefinitely set the seal on a common culture when the political, geographic and economic determinants of the culture are no longer the same throughout its area. Language, race and culture may be correlated but not necessarily. There is no inherent psychological relation between the three factors of language, race and culture. The coincidences of cleavage point to a readily intelligible historical association." The Welsh, free from either discouragement or encouragement from without, quietly maintain their language whereas in Scotland, under identical external conditions and with an analogous geographical situation, Gaelic is moribund.

The evidence seems to indicate that language may be a mark of otherness but that it is not a necessary or indispensable aspect of that quality or rather complex of qualities called "otherness" which marks off one cultural group from another. In the case of the Jewish people the Hebrew language has served historically as a mark of Jewish distinctiveness. It has been one of the features or characteristics which have marked off the Jewish people from the rest of the world. It has served as a sign or symbol of its uniqueness. In other words, it has functioned as a differentia and can continue to serve as such if the Jewish people is determined to maintain it. But, in the light of the evidence, we are compelled to bow to the fact that it is not absolutely indispensable to Judaism as an ongoing process and a way of life. However, it would be premature to arrive at any definite conclusion until all the other arguments are marshalled and analyzed and their validity determined.

The Role of Language In Nationality

The history of language in group life affords further evidence of the untenability of the proposition that the Hebrew

language is indispensable. If we examine the role of language in nationality, another form of otherness, we find that Switzerland and Belgium, which are examples of compact nations, possess no language peculiar to themselves and lack a single language that is spoken by all their people. On the other hand, the Danish and Norwegian languages are almost identical, yet the people who speak these languages do not regard that fact as a reason for merging the two groups into one and surrendering their otherness. (Woolner, "Languages in History and Politics.") The Jewish group itself is a splendid example of this phenomenon. During the course of its development, the Jewish people at various intervals during its long history almost completely gave up the Hebrew language or adopted the use of the popular tongue of the country in which they lived or of the dominant culture of the time. Yet, the religious and cultural products of these periods retained and reflected the spirit of Judaism.

The notion that particular languages are the special and indispensable property or natural attributes of particular races, or are the characteristics of unique nationalities, or the inviolable features of distinct cultures has thus been rejected by the best thought and investigation in anthropology and linguistics. But, if that notion is untenable, it will not be possible to maintain that the Hebrew language is absolutely indispensable to the otherness of the Jewish group and to the survival of Judaism as a unique process, unless it can be shown that the Jewish people constitute a different kind of group—a group to which a unique language is indispensable. But if the Jewish people are not a race, not a nationality or not a cultural group, then there remains only one other type of group under which it can be considered: the international or transnational religious group.

The Role of Language In Religion

In the past as well as today, religions have been associated with some "sacred" language. The propagandists for these religions have encouraged the followers to believe that there exists some indispensable or inextricable relationship between the two. As a result, these sacred languages have become so ingrained in the texture of these religions that they have in some instances outlived the religion and, in general, exhibited remarkable survival powers. Islam has carried Arabic as the language of scripture and learning but that did not prevent the people under its sway, living in the various lands of Asia and Africa, from speaking their own natural, indigenous languages. Christianity has carried Latin as the language of Scriptures, yet Christians speak the language of the country in which they live. Sanskrit is used in Buddhism and Hinduism, but other languages are used by those who profess allegiance to those religions.

Religion, when properly understood as a cultural phenomenon, is seen to consist of a *what* and *how*—what the advocates of that religion believe and how or in what language these beliefs are expressed. It is difficult to see what particular causal relations may be expected to subsist between a selected inventory of religious experiences and the particular manner in which these are expressed. It is nevertheless true that the vocabulary of a language more or less faithfully reflects the ideas and cultural content of a religion. This thought should be a source of encouragement to the Jewish people interested in the preservation and development of Judaism as a religio-cultural phenomenon. The *what* is far more important than the *how* of our religious civilization and it seems perfectly possible for us to continue developing the *what* or con-

tent of Judaism even though American Jewry is rapidly losing possession of the Hebrew language.

Christianity has become a world-wide religion without a unifying sacred language as the possession of all Christians, and Judaism can continue to function as the world religion of the Jewish people even though the Hebrew language may cease to function as the unifying language of the people, of American Jews in particular.

An Ethical Will and a Memorial Tribute

In the Middle Ages, it was a frequent custom for parents to leave to their children a farewell message of ethical content in the form of a tzava-ah or will. The farewell message of Sigwart Cahnmann, which we publish here, merits an abiding place in this class of literature. We have introduced it with a few explanatory documents and notes provided by his son, and have appended to it a memorial tribute to him and his wife, Hedwig Cahnmann, which is a worthy response to the message of the father. —Editors.

DOCUMENTS FROM EUROPE

THREE Red Cross cables from Munich, Germany, reached this writer simultaneously in October, 1942. They were dated as of January 14, 1942, March 22, 1942, and April 17, 1942, respectively. The two earlier ones were signed by my mother, Hedwig Sara Cahnmann, the last one was signed by my father's widowed sister, Sophie Clementine Sara Kraemer.

First cable (in translation):

"Father, after stomach operation, slept peacefully into death, without suffering, on January 13. Greeted beloved children and relatives. Clementine and I support each other faithfully. Are confident in our hope to see you again. Congratulations to Hans."

Our father had died after four attempts of his children to rescue him, and his wife and sister, had failed. Death came to the old man as a redeemer.

Second cable:

"Received communication Weiss. Father, before his death, spoke much about you, blessed you. Found touchingly beautiful farewell letter of August last year. Clem and I are healthy, confident, unfortunately separated."

The two sisters-in-law lived in two separted barracks on the outskirts of Munich. But they were soon to be separated by a wide distance.

Third cable (signed by Clem Kraemer):

"Weiss cable communicated that children know about their father's death. Mother, sorry to say, has left, though together with good, intimate friends. Always courageous. Even I am still hopeful."

Our mother, together with the entire remaining Jewish community of Munich except a handful of old and sick people, had been deported, in the spring of 1942, to Camp Piaski near Lublin, Poland. Friends in Zurich tried to dispatch money to her. Yet, we could not communicate that we had meanwhile, with the help of distant relatives and by way of Switzerland and England, received a copy of our father's "touchingly beautiful" farewell letter.

Letter from Mrs. Rosa St . . ., Zurich, Switzerland, dated January 22, 1943:

". . . I am sorry to say that Fred Cahnmann's mother has died. The money which I had dispatched to her, came back to me. . . ."

Werner J. Cahnman,
Chicago, Illinois.

FAREWELL WORDS FOR MY DEAR WIFE AND FAMILY

(Started on my 69½ birthday, Aug. 9, 1941)

FULL of thanks, I am looking back in this fateful time on a rich and happy life, rich and happy because I was brought up during a pleasant time of youth by my good parents who guided my education in perfect harmony. It was a pleasure renewed over and over again through walking together alongside my only sister who has been my lucky star and later has also remained the mother-like advisor. Rich and happy because of a loving and faithfully caring lifemate, who selflessly and industriously worked and planned in the home, sought after the good and the beautiful with a zest for higher values, and gave me six thriving, good children whose education she guided with an almost unimaginable modesty and in a wisely understanding manner. For this, my above-all-beloved Hedwig, may you be thanked from the very bottom of my soul. My great sorrow, to leave you here far from our good children—unless a merciful fate should provide otherwise—is lessened by the knowledge that all of them have remained faithfully attached to each other, ready to help each other in difficult situations, united in the endeavor and the care to alleviate the fate of their parents. I know that this care will be doubled in the future for the beloved and adored mother. This thought, as a driving power, shall be a holy legacy to you, my dear children, inspiring a worthy competition for one to surpass the other.

To the 'farewell and good luck' which I'd like to put into these farewell words is joined the deep heartfelt wish that all of you, together with your lifemates, may be able to build a happy future for yourselves. Always to remain united in brotherly close attachment, that shall be your guiding star. You shall vouch for each other and help each other as companions and friends and as always faithful advisors.

Thus you will also gild in harmony the sunset of the life of your incomparable mother. With a feeling heart, I impart to you my fatherly blessing which may always be with you and protect you. Pass proudly and uprightly through life and withstand the hard trials and tribulations which this time has brought upon all of us. With self-esteem, but without arrogance, you shall recognize and acknowledge that you are Jews, and therefore obligated to an irreproachable, exemplary life. As good children, all of you are equally close to my heart, but especially stirred up right now are my thoughts about you, my brave Lilo as the youngest one who, having been saved from a most difficult situation which tested your courage, awaited the fulfillment of your longing through the union with your beloved one.

Each one of you children must today, in struggle and distress, conquer for himself the hard life and stand in it firmly. I cannot close my eyes, as I hoped long ago, in the comforting certainty that my house is in good care. But I have the confidence that the family sense and community spirit, which I have implanted in my children, can bridge many difficulties.

I also trust that it will be a duty and desire for you children to care for my sister, who has always been connected with me in a rare closeness of feeling. I thank Providence who was especially gracious to me in giving me such a sister, and I thank my sister with emotion for her faithful care. With attachment, I think of the whole family. How close to me were Clemerl, with the kindness of her heart, and the good Ferdi, both of whom were brought up in my parents' home.

How attached do I feel to the quietly caring Mix and to all the cousins. Grateful I remain beyond the grave to those who, ready to help, smoothed the way to the new homeland for my family. Without regret, I am departing from this life. It is the only sadness of my heart if indeed I shall not be able to look into your eyes once more and press you unto my heart, my good children, and if I shall have to leave you in loneliness, my good Hedl, wife and beloved one, and you, Clementine, best of all sisters.

But I do have the gratifying knowledge that you will stick together both through thoughts of me and out of your own volition. With tender love, I am embracing all of you once more in spirit. Good bye!

My funeral I wish to be in simple, traditional form, without a flowery funeral sermon. Simple and modest shall also be my tomb. May it be up to my oldest son Werner to compose a short memorial message for relatives and friends.

All dispositions of my possessions and estate, inasmuch as it will be still possible to dispose of them, shall be made by my wife as the sole heiress (or, if contact is possible, in agreement with my children). Inasmuch as a possibility and necessity should exist, I beg to take my good sister into consideration.

I am closing. The farewell words have become difficult for me to express. Keep me in good memory, but don't be too sad because of my death. Whosoever, in these times, has overcome life in his old age, is not to be pitied.

After 30 days of external mouring, restore completely everyday life.

Have my farewell greetings once more!

Your husband, father, brother, and cousin.

(Signed) SIGWART CAHNMANN

This nineteenth day of August, 1941.

IN MEMORIAM

SIGWART CAHNMANN, born February 9, 1872 at Rheinbischofsheim, Baden; dec. January 13, 1942 at Munich.

HEDWIG CAHNMANN, nee SCHUELEIN, born July 22, 1882 at Munich; deported to Piaski near Lublin, Poland, April 1942.

Our father has passed away, his only sister is gravely ill, and our mother is perishing in a camp in Poland. This is the final outcome of an otherwise happy life. Our father wishes a memorial message from me, but I am afraid that it will be tuned to a much more melancholy mood than his own farewell words which appear to have been inspired by a kiss from the Angel of Death.

I see our father before me, wearing a druggist's coat in his chemical factory or, again, humming a song while standing among the vegetable beds of his garden. I see him before me, carefree and enjoying the happiness of the moment, when he could amuse himself with jokes and jests, or honestly worrying when he talked over with me family affairs until late at night. All of us see him bodily before us with his silky, soft, blond hair, his fresh, rosy cheeks, his sensitive hands, his innocent, childlike, cheerful eyes which sometimes, however, might show quite a helpless and desperate expression—and the main impression remains both that of a deep, sincere joy of life and anguish of life. Included therein is a flair for storytelling and communicativeness, faithfulness and reliability and, above all, the sense of and the longing for an indestructable belonging together; for the joy is not whole unless it is shared, and anxiety can be borne only in common.

Our father linked us, learned city folk, to the Jewish village whence he came, and to an uninterrupted chain of forebears, who lived a good, wholesome, healthy, and uncomplicated life. He felt attached in equal measure to all the relatives, those who were outstanding as well

as those who were insignificant, just as the leaf feels attached to the tree and the branch to the trunk. His basic Jewish feeling, like that of so many South-German Jews, was at one with his family attachment, and to resign from the Jewish faith and to leave it was, therefore, as shocking to him as a sin against nature itself.

However, he spiritualized this basic experience through the feeling that being a Jew brings with it the obligation to lead an exemplary life. To such a life, in his opinion, everybody is called who knows how to listen and is willing to heed the call. This was the leading thought of his Jewish activities in the lodge of B'nai B'rith where he always supported the broad inclusion of all men of good will, being strict in his moral judgment, but not overrating intellectual preeminence, and thoroughly rejecting any valuation which would measure personality in terms of money. This was likewise the basic thought of his political activity which was entirely devoid of material interest and personal ambition, and which made him, from his early youth, an active co-worker in the only democratic party in Germany which was not imbued with dogmatic philosophies of class or religion, the Schwaebische Volkspartei.

He held in esteem everything which was genuine, sincere, and unspoiled because he found therein his own image. He was fond of his white-bewhiskered patriarchal Grand Duke Friedrich of Baden; he was proud of his comradeship of long years with the unrelenting pacifist, Professor Quidde; he found one of the best friends of his later years in the simple and wise leader of the Munich Jewish Orthodoxy, Max Feuchtwanger.

The victory of insincerity and dishonesty he did not hate, but he could not understand it. He was a disciple of Aaron, loving peace and leaving unto Providence the ways of revenge. He would not have been able to live without giving friendship and receiving friendship, and he has done both in ample measure. He possessed the gift to appear agreeable before God and men, and it is certain that fate has liked him. It has spared him the greatest disappointment: the experience of the insecurity of the imagined freedom, if he ever would have reached it, the hopeless fading away of the adored sister, and the disappearance to the death-plains of the East of the beloved wife, helpmate, friend, and queen of his life.

Our mother! Our father has commended her to our care, and we cannot do anything for her. We would like to be able to speak to her. We would like to say to her: "Be brave and fear not. We love you. We are proud of you. We want to be to you everything that you have been to us." But to talk about her, that is impossible for us. Her selfless insight was the consolation of our father, the support of her children. Her modesty was like a fairy tale. The goodness of her wisdom was inexhaustible. She did "not scoff, nor mourn, nor detest, but understood." She has understood the world and the people and her children better and has loved them more than she understood and loved herself.

We bow silently.

The Lord has given, the Lord has taken away, praised be the name of the Lord.

September, 1942:

WERNER J. CAHNMAN,
Chicago, Illinois.
HANS J. CAHNMANN,
New York, N. Y.
FRED CAHNMANN,
Camp Callan,
San Diego, California.
CHAWA MANSBACH,
Meshek Jagur, Palestine.
AUGUSTA SCHUELEIN,
Chicago, Illinois.
LILO CAHNMANN,
Kibbuz Ha-sorea,
Jokneam, Palestine.